

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-12 were rejected. In response, claims 1-10 and 12 have been amended. Applicant maintains that no new matter has been added.

### **I. Specification Objection**

The Office objected to the specification for not having an antecedent basis for “spring ball” in the specification. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Paragraph 0027 describes “The spring loaded balls 322 extend at least partially through holes 325 of the rotor 324.” Nonetheless, this objection is overcome herein by amending claim 3 to recite “a spring and at least one ball...”

### **II. Claim Objections**

The Office objected claims 1-12 for informalities. The Applicant agrees, and has amended those claims accordingly. Those objections are overcome herein by conforming the preambles of claims 1-12.

### **III. 35 USC 112 Rejection**

Claim 4 was rejected for lack of insufficient antecedent basis. This rejection is overcome by the newly amended claim 3. Applicant respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection.

### **IV. 35 USC 103**

The Office rejected claims 1, 3-8 and 9-12 as being obvious over by Lemire [US 6225580] in view of Allison et al [US 3,311,718]. Claims 1-6 were also rejected as being obvious over by Fowler et al. [US 4,62,084] in view of Tanaka et al. [US 4,857,677] and further in view of Allison et al. Applicant respectfully disagree and traverses these rejections.

Amended claim 1 recites a rotary switch mounted above and below a panel, comprising: sealing member disposed between a portion of the switch and an underside of the panel; a detent sub-assembly located entirely above the panel; and a knob that substantially covers the detent sub-assembly and is housed independent of the detent sub-assembly. Support for the amended claim can be found in paragraph 0020.

Amended claim 10 recites an independent detent sub-assembly and claim 11 already recites an independent detent sub-assembly.

Lemire does indeed disclose a switch with a sub-assembly on the user side of the panel, but fails to teach, suggest, or motivate a knob that substantially covers the detent sub-assembly and is independent of the detent sub-assembly. Indeed, the detent sub-assembly as shown in Lemire's figure is housed dependent on the knob 57 of Lemire. Applicant's figure 1 demonstrates prior art that shows similar to what is shown in Lemire's figure 5 in that the detent sub-assembly is housed dependent of the knob. Allison also demonstrates a knob that is housed inside and not independent to the detent sub-assembly. (See col. 2, lines 36-44 of Allison). Thus, neither Lemire nor Allison disclose, teach or even suggest what is recited in claims 1, 10 and 11.


As for Fowler, it teaches the exact opposite as claim 1 in which a knob (housing means 25 of Fowler) houses a detent sub-assembly (switched construction 20 of Fowler), and it fails to teach or even suggest a knob that houses a detent sub-assembly independently. (See col. 7, lines 42-45, figure 5 of Fowler). For Tanaka, while it teaches a dial knob to be operated independent of the detent sub-assembly, the detent sub-assembly still resides within the knob. (See figures 4 and 5, col. 4, lines 63-65). A shaft in Tanaka holds as the base to connect the knob and detent sub-assembly into one structure and thus the knob is not housing the detent sub-assembly independently. Thus, neither Fowler nor Tanaka teaches or even suggests the embodiment of claim 1.

Claims 2-9 and 12 all depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and thus shall be allowed for the same reasons claim 1 is being allowed. Applicant respectfully request the withdrawal of these rejections.

**V. Request For Allowance**

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application. The applicant requests allowance of all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,  
RUTAN & TUCKER

By   
Mei Tsang  
Reg. No. 56,122

Rutan & Tucker, LLP  
611 Anton Blvd., 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Costa Mesa, CA 92626-1931  
Telephone (714) 641-5100  
Fax (714) 546-9035